

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

-----X

In re Complaint filed by

ORDER

ELI RAITPORT

09-mc-567 (JG)

-----X

John Gleeson, United States District Judge:

On August 19, 2009, *pro se* litigant Eli Raitport filed a complaint and request to proceed *in forma pauperis* in this court. On April 27, 1993, Raitport was barred from filing any new action in this court without first obtaining leave of the court.

The instant complaint alleges: “The Social Security Administration is actively conspiring with the oligopolies persecuting inventors-entrepreneurs denying them benefits they are entitled to, making their life miserable.” Compl. at 2. In ostensible support of this claim, Raitport describes the problems “oligopolies and other large companies” face when independent inventors create new inventions, and suggests that these companies discourage independent inventing by conspiring with government and civic organizations against “inventors-entrepreneurs.” *Id.* Raitport alleges that he previously filed suit against the United States government for infringing some of his patents, but that the “judge of Federal Claims Court dismissed the three causes of action stating that they are of time.” Compl. at 3. Raitport further alleges that the Social Security administration recently denied Raitport’s claim for Social Security benefits, although he does not appear to have filed a new Social Security appeal. *Id.* None of these allegations states a claim on which relief may be granted.

Raitport has filed multiple prior civil actions in this and other courts. On April 27, 1993, this court entered an order in *Scientronic Corp., et al. v. Ring, et al.*, No. 91 CV 4475 (SJ), barring him from filing any new action in this court without first obtaining leave of the court. The instant complaint includes a “request to continue this case,” but offers no facts or legal arguments in support of such a motion. Given the nature of Raitport’s current claims and his history of frivolous litigation, the court’s limited resources would more properly be devoted to legitimate litigants and claims. Accordingly, Raitport is denied leave to file the instant action.

Raitport is barred from filing future *in forma pauperis* complaints without leave of the court. The Clerk of Court is directed to return without filing any future *in forma pauperis* complaint submitted by Raitport without a clear request for leave to file. The court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith and therefore *in forma pauperis* status is denied for purpose of an appeal. *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962).

So ordered.

John Gleeson, U.S.D.J.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
September 8, 2009